



Docket No.: 1454.1274

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Jürgen BRIESKORN

Serial No. 09/509,049

Group Art Unit: 2665

Confirmation No. 5412

Filed: March 21, 2000

Examiner: Daniel J. Ryman

For: COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed June 25, 2004, having a period for response set to expire on September 25, 2004. A Petition for a three-month extension of time, together with the requisite fee, is submitted herewith, making the period for response end on December 25, 2004.

In the June 25, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending in the applications and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,091,803 to Thompson; 5,287,352 to Jackson et al.; 6,366,653 to Yeh et al.; 5,483,530 to Davis et al.; 5,453,984 to Mueller; 5,892,764 to Riemann et al. (References A-F, respectively, in the September 30, 2003 Office Action; and 5,974,043 to Solomon (Reference C in the June 25, 2004 Office Action); and an article by Hofer (Reference U in the September 30, 2003 Office Action) were cited. Claims 1-16 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Newly Cited Prior Art: U.S. Patent 5,974,043 to Solomon

The Solomon patent is directed to a system for communicating information using the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and a wide area network, where the information transmitted over the PSTN may be encrypted.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In items 3-9 on pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Thompson in view of Jackson et al. and Solomon. On page 4, line 14 to page 5, line 4 of the Office Action it was acknowledged that Thompson and Jackson et al. do not teach or suggest "forwarding transmission data produced by said telecommunication terminal apparatus to said computer device ... for processing in said computer device by said processor and sending processed transmission data to said telecommunication terminal apparatus" (claim 1, lines 20-23). The teaching in Solomon of encrypting data before transmission over the PSTN was cited as disclosing this operation.

It is submitted that the combination of Thompson, Jackson et al. and Solomon, as they would be combined by a person of ordinary skill in the art without reference to the teachings in the subject application, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. In making the rejection, it was asserted, without any evidence of support for the assertion, that it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a second bus system that is utilized for the connection of individual internal assemblies of said telecommunication terminal apparatus ... to distribute information arriving at the telephone to the telephone's various components

(Office Action, page 4, lines 6-8). The Examiner acknowledged that Thompson did not teach this type of bus and there's no suggestion of such a bus in Solomon. Only Jackson et al. teaches the use of two bus systems. However, in the case of Jackson et al., the second bus system (GCI) has a greater bandwidth than the first bus system (ROLmlink) as described at column 5, line 29-33. As discussed in the first full paragraph on page 11 of the Amendment filed by certificate of mail on August 21, 2003 and received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 25, 2003, an internal bus that is slower than an external bus is not what one of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious. Thus, Jackson et al. teaches away from the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is submitted that none of the other references used in rejecting the claims teach or suggest modification of Thompson to utilize a second bus system as recited in claim 1.

Since claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and claim 14 recites "connecting individual internal assemblies of said telecommunication terminal apparatus with a second bus system having a smaller bandwidth than said first bus system" (claim 14, lines 6-7) and claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14, it is submitted that claims 1-16 patentably distinguish over the prior art for the reasons discussed above.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-16 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/27/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501



S&H Form: (12/04)

1Fw
2665
f**REPLY/AMENDMENT
FEE TRANSMITTAL**

Attorney Docket No.	1454.1274
Application Number	09/509,049
Filing Date	March 21, 2000
First Named Inventor	Jürgen BRIESKORN
Group Art Unit	2665

AMOUNT ENCLOSED	1020.00	Examiner Name	Daniel J. Ryman
-----------------	---------	---------------	-----------------

FEE CALCULATION (fees effective 12/08/04)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid For	Number Extra	Rate	Calculations
TOTAL CLAIMS		- =	0	X \$ 50.00 =	\$ 0.00
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS		- =	0	X \$ 200.00 =	0.00
Since an Official Action set an <u>original</u> due date of <u>September 25, 2004</u> , petition is hereby made for an extension to cover the date this reply is filed for which the requisite fee is enclosed (1 month (\$120)); (2 months (\$450)); (3 months (\$1,020)); (4 months (\$1,590)); (5 months (\$2,160)):					1020.00
If Notice of Appeal is enclosed, add (\$500.00)					
If Statutory Disclaimer under Rule 20(d) is enclosed, add fee (\$130.00)					
Information Disclosure Statement (Rule 1.17(p)) (\$180.00)					
Total of above Calculations =					\$ 1020.00
Reduction by 50% for filing by small entity (37 CFR 1.9, 1.27 & 1.28)					
TOTAL FEES DUE =					\$ 1020.00

- (1) If entry (1) is less than entry (2), entry (3) is "0".
(2) If entry (2) is less than 20, change entry (2) to "20".
(4) If entry (4) is less than entry (5), entry (6) is "0".
(5) If entry (5) is less than 3, change entry (5) to "3".

METHOD OF PAYMENT

- ☒ Check enclosed as payment.
- ☐ Charge "TOTAL FEES DUE" to the Deposit Account No. below.
- ☐ No payment is enclosed and no charges to the Deposit Account are authorized at this time (unless specifically required to obtain a filing date).

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

- ☒ If the above-noted "AMOUNT ENCLOSED" is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any additional fees necessary to:
- Deposit Account No. 19-3935
- Deposit Account Name STAAS & HALSEY LLP
- ☒ The Commissioner is also authorized to credit any overpayments or charge any additional fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 (filing fees) or 37 CFR 1.17 (processing fees) during the prosecution of this application, including any related application(s) claiming benefit hereof pursuant to 35 USC § 120 (e.g., continuations/divisionals/CIPs under 37 CFR 1.53(b) and/or continuations/divisionals/CPAs under 37 CFR 1.53(d)) to maintain pendency hereof or of any such related application.

SUBMITTED BY: STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Typed Name	Richard A. Gollhofer	Reg. No.	31,106
Signature	<i>Richard A. Gollhofer</i>	Date	12/27/04